DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 314 CS 211 304

AUTHOR Jordan, Myron K.
TITLE Illegal, Unethical or Just Fattening? A Revisionist Look at the FTC Hearings on Electric Utility Public Relations and Franklin Roosevelt's 1932 Public Power Pledge.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Editorials; Ownership; *Persuasive Discourse; *Political Issues; Presidential Campaigns (United States); Presidents of the United States; *Propaganda; *Public Relations; *Utilities
IDENTIFIERS *Federal Trade Commission; Political Rhetoric; Power Plants; Roosevelt (Franklin D)

ABSTRACT

Did President Franklin D. Roosevelt's condemnation of electric utility public relations represent a fair interpretation of the findings of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) investigation into the electric utility industry as authorized by Senate Resolution 83 in February, 1928, or were Roosevelt's statements simply campaign hyperbole that met the political need for a villain to attack without risk in the anti-business climate of 1932? Roosevelt, drawing upon the FTC hearings, accused the utilities of planting lies and falsehoods in the newspapers--many of which were at least partially owned by the utilities. As the master politician that he was, Roosevelt carefully ignored the fact that the newspapers were willing accomplices, accepting public utility advertising and news releases. Of the eight accusations leveled by the FTC against electric utility public relations, only these four deserve serious reflection: (1) the deluge of news releases; (2) the syndicated editorial clip sheets with undisclosed utility sponsorship; (3) the size and scope of utility advertising; and (4) the combined weight of utility advertising and public relations in comparison to the efforts of public power advocates. Roosevelt's Portland speech denouncing utilities grossly misinterpreted the FTC's findings, and should be considered only campaign rhetoric. It was a master political stroke that diverted attention from the central issues of power generation and distribution to the peripheral question of public relations. (Thirty-nine notes are included and 14 sources are appended.) (RAE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296314

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Myron K. Jordan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ILLEGAL, UNETHICAL OR JUST FATTENING?

A Revisionist Look at the FTC Hearings on Electric Utility Public Relations and Franklin Roosevelt's 1932 Public Power Pledge

By

Myron K. Jordan
School of Communications, DS-40
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
(206)-546-2101

Presented to the Public Relations Division,
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications,
Portland, Oregon, July 2-5, 1988

CS011304

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ILLEGAL, UNETHICAL OR JUST FATTENING?

A Revisionist Look at the FTC Hearings on Electric Utility Public Relations and Franklin Roosevelt's 1932 Public Power Pledge

In a 1932 campaign speech in Portland, Oregon, Franklin Roosevelt, Democratic candidate for the Presidency, accused the nation's private electric utilities of a systematic public relations program of ". . .lies and falsehoods."[1] Roosevelt declared that a Federal Trade Commission investigation showed the editorial columns of the nation's newspapers were permeated with propaganda ". . .bought and paid for by certain great private utility corporations."[2]

The remainder of Roosevelt's speech, premised on a press corrupted by private utility public relations, laid out a plan for a "yardstick" of public power development. In the Northwest and throughout the nation, new Federal public power systems would

become the standard against which the efficiency and rates of private electric utilities would be measured in the future, Roosevelt proposed.

It was a campaign promise fulfilled within a year by the start of construction on the first of the great Columbia River dams at Bonneville and the preliminary work on the even more awesome Grand Coulee project. The Federal Bonneville Power Administration, a regional power distribution and marketing system, was guided through Congress in 1937 by FDR.

Roosevelt's denunciation of utility public relations became the touchstone for the government leaders and the political organizations supporting public power development in the 1930s. In the intervening years since Roosevelt's Portland speech, public power has become entrenched in the Pacific Northwest mindset. A December, 1987 Seattle Post-Intelligencer editorial page commentary says that for Pacific Northwest residents public power has become a "religion."[3]

This paper will examine the question of whether Roosevelt's condemnation of electric utility public relations represented a fair interpretation of the findings of the Federal Trade Commission investigation into the electric utility industry as authorized by Senate Resolution 83 in February, 1928. Or if FDR's statements were simply campaign hyperbole that met the political need for a villain to attack without risk in the anti-business climate of 1932. Of course, the promise of public power con-

struction jobs gave the president-to-be a theme that was certain to attract votes in the depression year election.

Some journalism historians have accepted and repeated Roosevelt's statements criticizing the utility public relations programs. Alfred McClung Lee incorporated details from the FTC hearings into his The Daily Newspaper in America.[4] Edwin Emery noted the hearings briefly in his American Newspaper Publishers Association history.[5] Ray Hiebert drew a contrast between the public relations strategy of the electric utilities and Ivy Lee's principles in Courtier to the Crowd.[6] Prof. Marvin N. Olasky in a 1987 monograph asserts that 1920s utility public relations manipulated the public into believing it was protected by government regulation when it was not.[7]

The source for all of these critiques as well as Olasky's thesis is the summary of FTC hearings into electric utilities published in 1934 as Senate Document 92, 70th Congress, First Session, "Utility Corporations: Efforts by Associations and Agencies of Electric and Gas Utilities to Influence Public Opinion."[8]

However, a close examination shows that many journalism historians including Olasky have leaned heavily upon secondary sources.[9] Among these are The Public Pays, a 1931 summary and popularization of the FTC's hearings by Ernest Gruening, later a US Senator from Alaska, and Confessions of the Power Trust, a 1932 review of the hearings by Carl Dean Thompson, a long time public power activist. Olasky also draws heavily from Power Ethics by Jack Levin, who is identified as ". . .on the research

staff of 'People's Legislative Service,' an early equivalent of Nader's Raiders."[10]

SUBVERTING THE PRESS

The Federal Trade Commission--and those who extracted their data from its hearing records and exhibits--condemned a range of public relations activities by the electric utilities. The public relations campaign included press materials, pamphlets, public talks, school programs, employment of college professors, student internships and memberships in civic clubs and community organizations.

The focus of this paper, however, is the electric utility campaign as it concerned the press. The major indictments of electric utility influence over the press brought forward in the FTC hearings and in the writings of electric utility critics were:

1. Some newspapers were partially owned by electric utilities; one chain newspaper publisher may have also owned a controlling interest in an electric utility.

2. The electric utilities created state and nation-wide committees for the purpose of carrying out a campaign of publicity favorable to private utilities.

3. These committees hired experienced news people to conduct the public relations program aimed at the newspapers.

4. The electric utility public relations people used their friendships with members of the press to the advantage of their

employers, and, in some instances, entertained newspaper people by buying them theater tickets, dinners and drinks.

5. The electric utilities deluged the press with releases and with clip sheets or bulletins, some of which appeared as editorials in newspapers. They also supplied information in response to press inquiries about utilities.

6. Syndicated editorial clip sheets, at least partially subsidized by electric utilities but without a disclosure of that fact, were distributed to newspapers.

7. The electric utilities mounted a major advertising program. This intimidated newspapers into using utility news or editorial clip sheets.

8. The weight of the combined public relations and advertising effort of the electric utilities overwhelmed the contrary views of public power advocates in the press.[11]

The list is a formidable one. However, when examined either from the perspective of the 1920s or in the context of today's circumstances the eight charges appear less significant. Four of them have no substance; the remaining four charges raise questions that deserve further exploration.

UTILITY OWNERSHIP OF NEWSPAPERS

The claim utility companies owned newspapers is based upon two somewhat shaky examples. Ira C. Copley held a majority ownership in Western United Gas and Electric Company in Northern Illinois. He also owned newspapers in Aurora, Elgin and Joliet, Illinois. Subsequently, he purchased the Illinois State Journal,

Springfield, and a chain of suburban newspapers in Southern California. Copley testified at the FTC hearings he had sold his utility interests. Thompson and Gruening both contended that Copley retained his utility interests while expanding his newspaper ownership. Neither offers documentation for the claims.[12]

A second instance of newspaper ownership by utility companies was the International Paper Company. It had developed power generation for its paper-making facilities, and later acquired an interest in the New England Power Companies. It held common stock, preferred stock and notes in a number of newspapers, including the Chicago Daily News, Chicago Journal, Boston Herald-Traveler and Brooklyn Eagle. It also made purchase offers for a number of smaller newspapers in the south. Witnesses for International Paper testified before the FTC their newspaper interests were purchased so ". . .that they could control contracts with these papers for supplying them with print paper for their newspapers."[13] It is also possible International Paper accepted the stock and notes when newspapers were unable to pay for newsprint on a current basis. In any case, there is no evidence that International Paper used its minority ownership position in any of these newspapers in support of the utility public relations program.

COMMITTEES CREATED FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS PURPOSES

The organization of the National Electric Light Association and its state utility information committees to carry out the public relations campaign was no novelty. Such organizations had

long since become a commonplace practice in government, politics and business. The railroads, for example, had created a similar unified front to combat the passage by Congress of the original Interstate Commerce Commission Act in the 1880s. They put together comparable public relations organizations to oppose Theodore Roosevelt's plan for strengthening the ICC through the Hepburn Act in 1906.

The Federal Government itself had established the Committee on Public Information to mobilize support behind the war effort in 1917-1918. Samuel Insull, president of Commonwealth Edison, headed the Illinois State Council of Defense. The Illinois Council carried out a campaign to mobilize public opinion that became a model for the nation as well as other states.[14] Thus, there was ample professional knowledge of these kinds of committees within the newspaper field and acceptance of their function by the public.

EX-NEWSPAPER PEOPLE DIRECT THE ELECTRIC PR CAMPAIGN

It was also generally known that public relations drew upon newspaper ranks to staff these committees. The obvious reason was that ex-news people brought to public relations assignments a knowledge of news techniques as well as contacts with former colleagues on the newspapers. The precedent for former newspaper people as public relations functionaries reached back at least to the Civil War. That the FTC, or those who excerpted the record of its hearing, thought this exceptional is baffling.

PRESS ENTERTAINMENT

There was also an equally long tradition of extending entertainment and other assistance to newspaper representatives by organizations seeking favorable coverage. If the newspaper entertainment expenses cited from the FTC hearings are correct, the amounts involved were nominal even in terms of 1920s prices. The Missouri director of the National Electric Light Association Information Bureau said he had ". . .spent as much as $300 in three years entertaining editors, etc. Some of them do enjoy a little drink."[15] At $100 a year it seems unlikely the utilities could have corrupted many thirsty Missouri newspaper people.

A DELUGE OF PRESS RELEASES

Nor does the accusation the press was inundated in a flood of news releases appear to be a significant charge. Newspapers expected to cope with the thousands of the public relations press releases received daily, and had large waste baskets for the disposal of unwanted material.

However, the distribution of syndicated material aimed at op-ed or editorial page usage through sources that masked their sponsorship, the extensive advertising campaign and its linkage with editorial support go the heart of the FTC hearing record and Roosevelt's charges. These syndicates were the channels that supplied the "lies and falsehoods" to which Roosevelt attested. It was advertising pressures, Roosevelt said, that coerced newspapers into "permeating editorial columns" with a "false public policy."[16]

EDITORIAL CLIP SHEETS FROM NO WHERE

The FTC hearings identified two major editorial syndicate sources in addition to monthly bulletins distributed to editors by most electric utilities. The company-published bulletins were clearly identified. These two syndicates, however, sent out editorial materials favoring private electric utilities without disclosing their financial support by the utilities. These were the Darnall Newspaper Service, operated by Darcy B. Darnall, editor of the Florence, Alabama, Messenger, and E. Hofer and Sons, Salem, Oregon. Of the two, Hofer and Sons was by far the largest, sending its canned editorials to between 13,000 to 14,000 newspapers nationwide.[17] The Darnall service went to about 600 newspapers, mostly in the Southeast.[18]

E. Hofer and Sons, former publisher of the Salem Capital Journal, distributed a monthly magazine called The Manufacturer and a weekly clip sheet named the Industrial News Bureau. Starting in 1922, the Hofer operation gained the financial support of private electric utilities nationally. The pro-business and pro-utility tone of the two publications remained as it had been since the syndicate began in 1912. For this, E. Hofer and Sons were paid $84,000 annually. This program was continuing when Robert M. Hofer testified before the FTC hearing in October, 1928.[19]

According to the Hofers' records, the service was extremely successful in achieving use of its editorials. During 1927 it had recorded the use of its editorials in 12,784 newspapers in the

then 48 states.[20] The intent of the Hofers' service was to provide material that would appear ". . .as original editorial comment in the rural press and smaller city dailies . . .in favor of business and industrial stability."[21]

The central purpose of the editorial service was spelled out in Hofer's prospectus that became a part of the FTC hearing record.

> We show the blighting effect government or public ownership has on private initiative and enterprise. We show that drastic and radical rate regulation which kills utility development hurts the community worse than [it hurts] the company; we show that exorbitant taxation of business is simply indirect taxation of the consuming public. And so on through a long list of subjects which are fundamental to the profitable and successful operation of business and the employment of labor.[22]

The critics of the utilities argued that subsidization of editorial services was unethical and deceptive. Editors were unaware the free service they received was actually purchased by the interests whose objectives the editorials served, according to critics.

In the hearings, Hofer said that the masthead of the Manufacturer carried a disclaimer explaining its source. He pointed to a sentence that read: "It (the Manufacturer) solicits and receives subscriptions from individuals and corporations and any who believe in the principle that community prosperity and growth, sound and reasonable government, both national and local, must precede individual and corporate prosperity."[23] This indicated, he said, that the service was sponsored. The number of

sponsors made it impossible to list them individually in each issue, he said.

In addition, electric utility news bureaus frequently reproduced the canned editorials from the Hofers or Darnall that had appeared in newspapers and re-distributed them as if they were original commentary from these newspapers. Critics also pointed out the Darnall and the Hofer services sometimes used the bylines of notables over editorials that had been written by their own staffs or by electric utility people. One instance of factual error in the syndicate editorials was also established in the hearings.

Among the Hofer editorials cited by the FTC as showing a pro-private power bias were: the extent of stock and bond ownership in utilities by the general public; efficiency of private enterprise over government ownership; the number of municipal electric facilities sold, shut down or abandoned; utility employees as factors in public relations; progress depends on private initiative; a speech by Samuel Insull; and the placing of a historic landmark plaque by an electric utility in Philadelphia.[24]

INTIMIDATION BY ADVERTISING

Electric utility advertising in newspapers was another major topic brought before the FTC hearings. The Public Utilities Advertising Association encouraged all utilities to advertise extensively and regularly in newspapers. The Association said utility advertising in 1923 had increased to $11,000,000 a year, and projected that within five or six years utility advertising

would total from $25 million to $30 million a year.[25] When the $25 million to $30 million figure was put in the hearing record in 1928 as the current level, the Utility Advertising Association challenged it. The Association said the actual total that year for all advertising by utilities was $13,044,143 and that newspaper advertising was $8,425,320.[26]

Public power advocates retorted that the precise level of utility advertising was not the issue. The concern of the FTC was that the utilities used their advertising as a means to pressure newspapers into using utility press releases. The FTC argued that behind the advertising was an unspoken threat--unless newspapers complied with the utility public relations program they would receive no advertising from the utilities. The electric utility publicity executives reported frequently on how successful they were in forcing their way into the news and editorial columns through timely advertising. Their boasts of these tactics became documentation in the FTC hearings.[27] The FTC hearings also produced evidence that some newspapers offered to use the news releases or editorials if an advertising contract was included for the newspaper.[28]

UTILITY PUBLIC RELATIONS OVERWHELMS ITS ADVERSARY

Finally, the FTC argued, it was the weight of the combined public relations and advertising campaigns of the electric utilities that was repugnant. That is, the total expenditures put forth on behalf of private electric utilities so exceeded the efforts of public power advocates that the latter in reality were

without a voice in the press. "The sheer weight and power of the tremendous advertising and propaganda funds of the utilities overwhelms the field," is Thompson's summation of the thousands of pages of testimony and exhibits placed before the FTC hearing.[29]

What seems most damning to Gruening, Thompson and Olasky is the professed repentance of certain utility public relations people at the time of and after the 1928 hearings. A letter from J. B. Sheridan, NELA public relations director for Missouri, critical of the speculative financing in which some utilities were engaging is cited by Gruening, Thompson and Olasky. Sheridan also questioned the effectiveness of public service commission regulation in several midwestern states.[30] This so-called "confession," Gruening, Thompson and Olasky contend, is the ultimate evidence of the hypocrisy of utility public relations. Sheridan's descent into alcoholism and his suicide in April, 1930 was allegorical proof of the sinfulness of electric utility public relations to the critics.[31]

Olasky expanded the idea of utility public relations guilt. He points out that the utility holding companies built by Insull, a leader in the utility public relations movement, failed in the aftermath of the 1929 stock market crash. Olasky says: "Insull left the United States but was extradited from Turkey and brought back to Chicago for trial, then jail."[32] In fact, Insull was tried three times on Federal and state charges and acquitted in all three cases. His only jailing occurred when he was booked on

the Federal mail fraud charge; he remained in jail overnight when there was a delay in posting his bond.[33]

HYPOCRITICAL PR OR A CORRUPTIBLE PRESS?

At the outset this paper posed several questions. Was Roosevelt's denunciation of electric utility public relations a fair interpretation of the FTC hearings? Or was it simply rhetoric to provide a foundation for the accompanying campaign pledge of a major commitment on the part of the Federal government to public power development in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere?

Of the eight accusations leveled by the FTC against electric utility public relations, only these four deserve serious reflection: the deluge of news releases; the syndicated editorial clip sheets with undisclosed utility sponsorship; the size and scope of utility advertising; and the combined weight of utility advertising and public relations in comparison to the efforts of public power advocates. Their interrelationship makes them inseparable.

News releases were no novelty to editors in the 1920s. In 1921, Walter Lippmann noted that a great part of the daily newspaper grist was filtered through publicity agents. Public relations was a commonplace as he saw it. He observed:

> The development of the publicity man is a clear sign that the facts of modern life do not spontaneously take a shape in which they can be known. They must first be given a shape by somebody, and since in the daily routine reporters cannot give a shape to facts, and since there is little disinterested organization of intelligence, the need for some formulation is being met by the interested parties.[34]

It is the task of newspaper editors to make decisions about news, including the news releases that daily cross their desks, Lippmann argues. Thus, the editors of the 1920s, confronted with a blizzard of utility releases, were operating in a milieu that was completely familiar to them. On the other hand, the FTC and the critics of utility public relations portray news releases as something strange and new in the newspaper experience.

The syndicated editorial clip sheets raised a somewhat different issue. These publications posed as responsible aids to a busy weekly or small daily editor. They did not disclose that electric utilities and other businesses funded their production and distribution so that they arrived at no cost to the newspaper user. What the FTC seemed to consider most damning was the high success rate the Hofers achieved with their editorial service. From 1923 through 1927, the Hofers sent out their two publications, resulting in 7,743,168 inches of published material or enough to fill 64,526 (6 column by 20 inch) newspaper pages.[35] The FTC introduced an exhibit showing that in 1927 alone reproduction of Hofer material totaled 3,111,420 inches or 25,929 pages.[36] These totals included all Hofer material used by newspapers, however. Hofer pointed out under cross examination that the utility articles were only a small percentage of the total.[37]

The subject matter of the Industrial News Bureau and the Manufacturer provides obvious clues as to their sponsorship. A clip sheet that condemns all municipal power ownership and any government role in power is clearly partisan. The frequent

inclusion of speeches made by private power officials was another tip off. Only an incredibly naive or obtuse editor could have been misled as to sponsorship of the Hofer clipsheets. Nor did the FTC consider that some editors may have agreed with the viewpoints expressed by the syndicate clip sheets.

This concealment of sources is what Ivy Lee, who had entered the public relations field in 1904 and was the best known publicist of the 1920s, termed "propaganda" in a pejorative sense. "The essential evil of propaganda," Lee told audiences in 1924-25, "is failure to disclose the source of information."[38] Lee went on to say that the answer to the confusion over publicity and propaganda lay with newspaper editors. "'Use your judgment when information comes to your desk,' and by saying to the public: 'Exercise your right to demand knowledge as to the source of the information which is given concerning any fact.'"[39]

The link between advertising and publicity has a long and sometimes shadowy tradition in American newspapers. The necessity for newspapers to earn most of their revenue from advertising makes it almost inevitable that advertisers will attempt to bargain their way into the news and editorial columns. The electric utilities trod a path followed by many before them and since. What is surprising is that the FTC attached so much significance to a long standing business practice. Indeed, some newspapers offered news coverage or editorial treatment to utilities on the condition they also received advertising insertions.

CONCLUSIONS

Roosevelt, drawing upon the FTC hearings, accused the utilities of planting lies and falsehoods in the newspapers. As the master politician that he was, he carefully ignored the fact that the newspapers were willing accomplices, accepting public utility advertising and news releases. The utilities' editorial campaign through the masked sources of the Hofer and Darnall syndicates would be considered unethical today. Indeed, it aroused the FTC attorneys in the 1920S. However, the newspapers that neglected their responsibility for evaluating the sources of editorials or news releases were equally culpable.

Was the combined weight of the utility campaign unfair? It was certainly unfair from the standpoint of the public power advocates. A group seeking public support that finds itself out spent in public relations and advertising invariably insists the weight of the opposing campaign is unfair.

There is, however, a more fundamental question to be answered. Who is to be the judge of that highly subjective value--"fairness?" The First Amendment freedom that the press holds so dear puts that decision squarely on the shoulders of editors. The press in America traditionally and almost universally has opposed the idea of any oversight of its news and editorial role.

The FTC hearing record produced no evidence of illegality. Unethical? Perhaps, in retrospect from the 1980s the electric utility public relations programs were borderline. In the

context of the 1920s they met the standards of that and earlier periods. However, if utility public relations were "hypocritical," the newspapers were easily "corruptible." The criticism for a questionable utility public relations campaign must be shared by the newspapers who accepted utility advertising, printed utility news releases and did not question the source of their canned editorials. Fattening? Yes, it was for both the public relations organizations that conducted the campaign and for the newspapers whose revenues benefited from the utility advertising.

Roosevelt's Portland speech denouncing utilities grossly misinterpreted the FTC's findings, and should be considered only campaign rhetoric. It was a master political stroke that diverted attention from the central issues of power generation and distribution to the peripheral question of public relations. But Roosevelt learned well from the tactics of the private utilities. As President, Roosevelt's leadership was the backbone of a public power public power campaign whose scope, techniques and successes dwarfed the efforts of private utilities in the 1920s.

###

NOTES

1. Samuel I. Rosenman, ed., The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vol. I(New York: Random House, 1938), p. 729.

2. Ibid.

3. Shelby Scates, "Battle for Cheap Kilowatts," Seattle Post-Intelligencer, December 20, 1987, p. F5.

4. Alfred McClung Lee, The Daily Newspaper in America(New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937), pp. 464-7.

5. Edwin Emery, History of the American Newspaper Publishers Association(Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1950), p. 130.

6. Ray Eldon Hiebert, Courtier to the Crowd, The Story of Ivy Lee and the Development of Public Relations(Ames, Iowa State Press, 1966), p. 89.

7. Marvin N. Olasky, "The Development of Corporate Public Rela tions," Journalism Monographs, Number 102, April, 1987, p. 24.

8. Ibid., pp. 15-17, 20-24.

9. These sources are: Jack Levin, Power Ethics(New York: Knopf, 1931), Ernest Gruening, The Public Pays(New York: Vanguard Press, 1931) and Carl Dean Thompson, Confessions of the Power Trust, Arno Press reprint, 1976(New York:Dutton, 1932).

10. Olasky, p. 39.

11. This summary is drawn from Gruening, pp. 160-210; Olasky, pp. 19-24; Thompson, pp. 269-320.

12. Thompson, p. 300.

13. Ibid., pp. 303-4.

14. Forest McDonald, Insull(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 170-1.

15. Thompson, p. 319; Gruening, p. 164.

16. Rosenman, ed., p. 729.

17. Thompson, p. 323.

18. Ibid., p. 322,

19. Investigation of Utility Companies, 70th Congress, First Session, Senate Document 92, Part 7, p. 225. (Hereafter cited as Senate Document 92.)

20. Ibid., p. 280.

21. Gruening, p. 192.

22. Thompson, p. 324.

23. Senate Document 92, Part 7, p. 230.

24. Gruening, pp. 194-7; Senate Document 92, Part 7, p. 333-4.

25. Thompson, p. 314.

26. Ibid.

27. Olasky, p. 20.

28. Gruening, pp. 207-8.

29. Thompson, p. 329.

30. Ibid., pp. 8-16; Gruening, pp. 244-247.

31. Olasky, p. 24.

32. Ibid., p. 23.

33. McDonald, p. 319.

34. Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion, The Free Press, 1965(New

York: Macmillan, 1922), p. 218.

35. Senate Document 92, Part 7, p. 230-1.

36. Ibid., p. 280.

37. Ibid., p. 241.

38. Ivy L. Lee, "Publicity: Some of the Things It Is and Is Not," Address to the American Association of Teachers of Journalism, Chicago, December 30, 1924(New York: Industries Publishing Company, 1925) p. 23.

39. Ibid., p. 24.

###

SOURCES

Emery, Edwin, History of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1950.

Gruening, Ernest, The Public Pays, New York: Vanguard Press, 1931.

Hiebert, Ray Eldon, Courtier to the Crowd, The Story of Ivy Lee and the Development of Public Relations, Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1966.

Lee, Alfred McClung, The Daily Newspaper in America, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.

Lee, Ivy L., "Publicity: Some of the Things It Is and Is Not," Address to the American Association of Teachers of Journalism, Chicago, December 30, 1924, New York: Industries Publishing Company, 1925.

Levin, Jack, Power Ethics, New York: Knopf, 1931.

Lippmann, Walter, Public Opinion, The Free Press reprint, 1965, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.

McDonald, Forest, Insull, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Olasky, Marvin N., "The Development of Corporate Public Relations, 1850-1930," Journalism Monographs, No. 102, April, 1987.

Raushenbush, H. S. and Harry W. Laidler, Power Control,

New York: New Republic, Inc., 1928.

_____, High Power Propaganda, New York: New Republic, Inc., 1928.

Rosenman, Samuel I.,ed., The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York: Random House, 1938.

Scates, Shelby, "Battle for Cheap Kilowatts," Seattle Post-Intelligencer, December 20, 1987.

Thompson, Carl Dean, Confessions of the Power Trust, Arno Press reprint 1976, New York: Dutton, 1932.

US Senate Document 92, Part 7, 70th Congress, First Session, Investigation of Utility Companies, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1934.

###